

same problem we have now. But, nevertheless, the issue of taxation of personal property has been of longstanding. The reason I am putting this in because I have observed over the years many times when an individual senator introduced a bill to repeal a particular exemption, and inevitably when you do that, even if you do it just for purposes of review or you do it by reason of reading the tax expenditure report that we require to be issued every two years by the Department of Revenue, whenever those are introduced, those individual senators have a very difficult time not to be accused of picking upon whatever segment had that exemption. And the result is that they really have no good review. Times change, they change dramatically. The economy changes and changes that are possible under this constitutional amendment, which I agree with, is that we can tax in whole or in part by valuation or otherwise, and that part is particularly interesting to me that you can tax tangible personal property some way other than valuation, which, in fact, has been the problem from the 1800s of which trying to find some reasonable way of taxing tangible personal property, recognizing that valuation frequently would not work. As precedent for this, by statute, we currently require local governments where county boards have the authority to grant exemptions within the Constitution, those are required, it has been law for some years now, it has been the law that every four years those must be reviewed and renewed to see if they still continue to merit that exemption. I also feel that it will strengthen the passage of this bill or this constitutional amendment at the special election. It will strengthen it because the citizens will know that whatever kind of exemption or whatever other...otherwise method of taxation is used, in fact, at least is going to be reviewed at 10-year intervals, and is not something that once started, just simply will never stop. I suspect that efforts will be made from time to time to expand those exemptions or attempt to do classifications, which may or may not be constitutional, but even if they are, it may well be important that they are reviewed periodically as to whether or not they are good tax policy. When we are removing the uniformity clause, as we are, as we had thought we had done in 1970, but when we are clearly removing the uniformity clause as far as tangible personal property, we take one of the protections out of the Constitution that has been in...a part of our Constitution since the 1850s, actually 1875, but before then as well. Once having taken that out, it seems to me that we ought to have another safeguard, and that safeguard would be at least the requirement, the mandate that the Legislature had to review